

12634 8041

THE
DAUGHTER'S DEFENCE
OF
HER FATHER;
OR,

AN ANSWER TO THE LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

MR. HUNTINGTON,

Written by Madame (de MARA) FLORA, and Co.

CONTAINING

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THAT PERFORMANCE,
AND A DEFENCE OF THE "MODERN PLAS-
TERER DETECTED."

By ELIZABETH MORTON. *K*

*As for my people, Children are their oppressors, and Women rule
over them, Isa. iii. 12. But I suffer not a Woman to teach, nor
to usurp authority over the Man, but to be in silence, 1 Tim. ii. 12.*

L O N D O N :

Sold by G. Terry, Paternoster-row; J. Chalmers, No 210, White-
cross-street, near Moorfields; J. Davidson, No 7, Postern-row,
Tower-hill; Mr. Baker, No 226, Oxford-street; Mrs. Howes,
No 15, Charles-street, Wells-street; at Monkwell-street Chapel
every Tuesday evening; at Providence Chapel, Titchfield-street;
by Mr. Mantle, Lewes, Sussex; Mr. Fenley, Broad Mead, Bristol;
and by Mr. Chalmers, Cambden-alley, Portsmouth Common.

MDCCLXXXVIII.



A
T R E A T I S E,
&c. &c.

TO MARIA de FLEURY.

MADAM,

HAVING read with much attention your little pamphlet, entitled, "A LETTER TO THE REV. MR. HUNTINGTON," I find myself much disposed to answer it; for I am well persuaded, as a minister of Jesus Christ, Mr. H. has work sufficient upon his hands, and of greater moment than to notice an address to him from a nameless author, introduced under the specious appearance of CANDOUR.

The unfairness of your treatment, and the odium that you have attempted to cast on his ministry under that flattering title, appears much worse to me than what you are pleased to charge as spleen in him. I consider myself, Madam, as

one of your own sex, though I can always find a willing boldness to speak in defence of truth. I also think myself particularly justifiable in returning you this answer ; because I firmly believe God's making choice of him as an instrument of good to me, in preference to others, has stirred up the prejudice of these elder sons of Israel, and brought the resentment of this great combination upon him. I can assure you that I know several of these gentlemen, perhaps *better* than you do, and whom I am well convinced, from their own mouths, are strangers to God, and the killing power of his law. Since it has pleased God to set my soul at liberty, I have conversed with one of that society, who absolutely could not give a reason of the hope that was in him : and from the lives and conduct of others of the same association, whom I am well acquainted with, I have much reason to doubt their experience of a spiritual change agreeable to the word of truth, or their ever having received of *God* the message they take upon themselves to deliver ; but rather view them as *stumbling upon the dark mountains*, with the old *vail upon their heart*, and therefore may justly be called *ministers of the letter*, instead of evangelists. I ask, Madam, your reason for not putting your name to what you have written ? Are you fond of stabbing people in the dark ? Or was you fearful of the *light making manifest* the hypocrisy couched under the word

Candour,

Candour, when exposed to public view ? Or was you ashamed of the cause you had espoused ? Or afraid of the person you opposed ? For my part, I shall not act thus ; for I am not ashamed of the glorious gospel of Christ, nor unwilling to communicate what God has revealed to my heart ; nor have I the smallest objection to have my name at full length at the conclusion of what I am now writing. I add further, that as I disapprove of skulking writers, I have taken the liberty of putting your name also to my address to you.

As you charge my Father with having “ your motto out of sight, and out of mind, when he wrote the Plasterer ;” so I think my *motto* was out of your sight and mind when you penned your address to him ; for had you considered it, and been obedient to it as a positive rule for you, you would not have usurped authority over the man, nor have pretended to teach, but *have kept silence*, 1 Tim. ii. 12. But it is easy for some to give rules who live in avowed breach of them, or to bind burdens on others which themselves never touch. If ministers “ weapons are not carnal, but spiritual,” as you affirm, they can stand in no need of women’s tongues, which are but unruly members at best ; and as it is a promise that good men shall be *hid from the scourge of the tongue*, Job v. 21. it is a proof to me that it is more of a carnal weapon than a spiritual one, especially when ’tis to injure a gospel mi-

nistry, or to slander those that you own are sent of God. You observe, that "A good cause
"vindicated in a bad manner, always *loses ground*."

This, Madam, is unscriptural; and as I love Bible language, I do not admit of the term. This is a cant phrase I have often heard; but it is like many more of the school quiddities, a mere sound without a meaning, an apparent something that means nothing: for the cause of truth is a good cause, and the best of causes; and the cause of truth is God's cause, and a cause that God will never give out of his own hands. He will vindicate his own cause himself, therefore it shall never lose ground. Satan's cause, or an erroneous cause, shall and will lose ground, though it be vindicated in the best manner.

At first view, a simple reader might judge by your letter that you was a friend of Mr. Huntington's, and one that respects his ministry. By your gentle reproofs, seeming council, kind cautions, and pretended candour, a person might also imagine that you was sensibly grieved at his conduct. But a discerning eye may easily penetrate the intention of *this wife of Jeroboam, though she feigns herself to be another*, 1 Kings xiv. 6. Her whole drift is, to represent Mr. H as an erroneous man, and one of a bad spirit, and so exhibit him as a carnal preacher of falsehood; for if his heart is filled with spleen, and he advances errors, as she asserts, what can her drift be,

be, but to injure the ministry that he has received of God, and that God has been pleased to own and bless to hundreds, if not to thousands, in a most conspicuous manner?

As I do not make any pretensions to appear as a divine in orders, I shall not adopt your method of using heads—but that which I think better becomes women, I shall propose a few queries to you, and request an answer confirmed by the oracles of God.

Query 1. Whether a useful minister of Jesus Christ (who, without giving any offence), when charged in the public pulpit, of being of “a blood-thirsty spirit; one that would, if it was not for the laws of this country, swim this metropolis with blood; one that takes texts that a wise man would be ashamed of, and that modest men would blush at.” This was delivered at Mr. T.’s meeting-house at Rotherhithe, in the hearing of several friends who are ready to attest it, and was confirmed by my brother’s acknowledging to me, in the presence of a gentleman, that Mr. H. was the man levelled at. I ask, If a minister of Christ, who is a public character, be thus reproached without any just cause, and be called Antinomian, Sophist, cunning, player with arguments, twister of scripture, dangerous man, blood-thirsty, seditious, sower of discord, and party spirited, whether he has not a right,

may, whether it is not his duty, to defend his ministry, his doctrine, his life, his character, and the cause he espouses, in as public a way, and with as much authority and sharpness, as the base, iniquitous practices of such people require? Paul says, *Those that sin openly, rebuke them before all, that others may fear.*

Query 2. Whether your passing over in silence the public reproaches unjustly cast on Mr. Huntington, and laying all the blame upon the defendant, who only defended his own character and ministry, omitting to speak of the excellent doctrine and divinity the piece contains, whether this be consistent with that candour you profess (and it is evident only profess)? whether this be acting *without partiality, and without hypocrisy*, or agreeable to the Saviour's rule, that you *seem* to be such an advocate for, and observer of? seeing the Lord says, *Wo unto him through whom the offence (or slander) cometh.* I ask, from what part of God's word you, as a *woman*, have found authority to take up your pen, and act as arbitrator and commander in chief in defence of an host of men—and if the title they assume be applicable to themselves, they are the Lord's host—but who is this chief speaker in and among them? Who is this mighty Deborah, that *treads in the highways unoccupied*? Who is this teacher of the rulers? when Paul declares, *that it is a shame for women to speak in the church*, 1 Cor. xiv. 35. And in the
verse

verse preceding he says, *Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak.* But, alas! the wise man's saying is verified, *Every fool will be meddling*, Prov. xx. 3. The apostle had some such to trouble him in his days, whom he styles *idle, wandring about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also, and busy bodies*, 1 Tim. v. 13. meddling with those things which did not concern them.

Query 3. Whether there does not appear the spirit of truth, the spirit of power, and the spirit of understanding, in Mr. Huntington's book? If so, whether treating the whole book (without any notice of these things) as the effects of a bad spirit, be not a hypocritical and dangerous way of writing? and whether a slanderous discourse *proved* to be contrary to the oracles of God, can be the effects of a good spirit, or whether a spirit of lies and slander is to be defended before the spirit of truth? The scriptures aver, that *a man of understanding is of an excellent spirit*, Prov. xvii. 27. A man that publicly slanders a minister of Christ, without any provocation, and preaches false doctrines in order to injure him, is but a minister of confusion and falsehood at best, and we know *that God is not the author of confusion*, but Satan is. If your meekness and candour lead you to vindicate him who frustrates the grace of God, surely your bowels of compassion ought to be moved for him who contends for it. But it is
in

in this according to the old proverb, *Chacun a son semblable*. As you presume Mr. H. to be ignorant of the Latin, I take it for granted that you are ranked among the classics. If so, a French phrase cannot offend, much less puzzle or confound.

Query 4. Whether Paul made use of that "meekness and gentleness" you recommend to Mr. Huntington, to those that accused him, and preached legal doctrine to overthrow his? and whether you might not represent Paul as full of bitterness and spleen as my Reverend and Venerable Father; seeing he calls his accusers *false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the likeness of the apostles of Christ; ministers of Satan, whose end shall be according to their works*, 2 Cor. xi. 13. 15. *vain janglers*, 1 Tim. i. 6. *traitors, heady, high-minded, men-pleasers, despisers of those that are good, leaders and conquerors of silly women,—evil men,—and seducers*, 2 Tim. iii. 4. 6. 13. *sounding brass, and tinkling cymbals*, 1 Cor. xiii. 1. I intreat your Reverence to read the 4th chapter of Paul's second epistle to Timothy, and five first verses, and see whether his exhortation to his darling son be not needful, and applicable to many in the present day, though persons that *have itching ears* may wish to overturn it, or set it aside.

I ask, if there be any thing that you have extracted from my Father's pamphlet, which you
are

are pleased to term the effects of spleen and bitterness, so harsh, severe, and degrading as the above phrases of Paul, which he applied to his accusers and legal opposers; and whether opposing and exposing an accuser of the just, and a teacher of falsehood, be not a good work that the Lord commends rather than a bad one; for as good works are to be commended, so bad ones are to be condemned by *Wisdom's children*; we are commanded *to take heed what we hear*, Mark iv. 24. and ministers are to *try the Spirits, whether they are of God*, 1 John iii. 1. and are commended for so doing—*I know thy works; and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil, and thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles [or evangelists], and are not, and hast found them liars*, Rev. ii. 2.

Query 5. Whether Mr. Huntington be culpable for styling his false accuser a MODERN PLASTERER, as the word of God calls a man that *sees vanity, and divines lies, a dauber with untempered mortar*, Ezek. xiii. 10. *because, even because they have seduced my people, saying peace, when there was no peace, and one built up a wall and to others daubed it with untempered mortar*: which I take to mean *rough plastering*, done by one not qualified to do the work properly;—a slovenly workman, which the vulgar in country villages call a builder with *wattle and dab*; such daubers and daubings the scriptures compare a false preacher

preacher and a legal people to, and threaten both the builder and the building with eternal ruin together, Ezek. xiii. 15, 16.

Query 6. Might you not represent the blessed Saviour himself, and the whole scriptures, in as unfavourable a light as you have represented my Father and his pamphlet by this candid mode of yours—I mean by passing over unnoticed the excellent divinity of the Bible, and culling out a few expressions for the purpose of vilifying the author and injuring his ministry. Suppose a stranger to the Bible, and to the Saviour, was to ask you what you thought of that blessed book and its divine author, and you was pleased to adopt this method of yours in answer to them, Why, say you, Jesus was very bitter and rancorous, he called Herod the king a *fox*, Luke xiii. 32. and the venerable Scribes *children in the market place, calling to their fellows about piping and dancing*; he called the Pharisees *graves that appeared not—strainers at gnats, and swallowers of camels—devourers of widows houses—children of their father the devil—serpents, vipers—servants of mammon*, and said they should not *escape the damnation of hell*; thus according to your mode, Madam, you might represent the Bible itself, and its blessed Author, in as bad a light as you have attempted in your candour to represent my spiritual Father and his book. You will object, and say, the Plasterer is a gospel minister, but the Pharisees that

that the Saviour rebuked were enemies to the truth; to which I answer, I believe the Pharisees life and doctrine were full as consistent with the scriptures as his is, which I have long been a living witness of.

Query 7. Whether that which you call evil in Mr. H. be not the same in you? You accuse him of taking a "few scraps" out of the Plasterer's sermon in preference to transcribing the whole, while you have done worse by his book, for you have not mentioned one doctrine in it, but only picked out that which you thought would injure him in the work of the Lord; *when thou teachest another, teachest thou not thyself also?*

Query 8. Whether there be any thing in the worst fragment that you have abridged from Mr. Huntington's book that is unscriptural, or inapplicable to a false accuser, who has denied his profession as a Methodist Preacher, and attempted to get into Clare-hall, Cambridge, in disguise, when God permitted him to be discovered, and the heads of the college to turn him out on account of his former profession; this, Madam, is a truth—apply it to his conscience, and see whether he can contradict it—'tis now too publicly known for that; whether this unsuccessful step can be any part of the *divine rule* that he contends for, seeing *ministers are commanded to abide in their calling, wherein they are called*, 1 Cor. vii. 20. For my part I think a man that can do
this

this, is, according to Mr. H.'s assertion, fit for any thing but a preacher of Christ, and a profession of his name; Peter, who denied his profession in the High Priest's palace, brought a disgrace; and he that denies his profession to become an high priest, can never be said to bear the badge of them that are never to be *called Rabbi, rabbi*, but to be *servants of all*. I must confess I am greatly enlightened into the mystery of the Plasterer's contention for the ten commandments as the *only rule of life*, seeing his conduct is so diametrically opposite to every gospel rule laid down by Christ and his apostles, for ministers and professors of the gospel to *walk by*. As I am but a babe in grace, I cannot pretend to say what rules the law of Moses allows him, but as he was nothing but a poor illiterate journeyman plasterer in his former calling, and so profoundly ignorant at present (of divine things) as not to know law from gospel, I cannot find one text in all the New Testament that countenances his parsonic appearance in long robes—his use of the established form of prayer—his denying his profession to find favour in the eyes of them that hate God—his public slander of those that he evidently saw God owned and honoured, together with his light, vain, and reviling conversation, which I have so often heard and condemned, and which has been such, that one of the combination declared to me that
 he

he was ashamed to countenance him, and that his life and conduct also were such they did not like to preach for him, because they could not with propriety pray for him; if the person reads this pamphlet who told me these things, he will perfectly remember it. As I said before, I do not know what rules the law allows him, but this I will affirm, that the whole of his ministry and conduct appears diametrically opposite to every part and every word of the New Testament, and to every part of the Redeemer's conduct.

I have observed every particular of those fragments that you have collected out of my Father's book, and I can hardly find an unscriptural expression in all that you are pleased to call rancour, spleen, and bitterness. You seem offended with the honour of *knighthood* conferred on the Clare-hall student, which does not appear unscriptural, seeing we read of *Sir*, of *Ham*, and of the *land of Ham*, of *cottish*, or *effeminate men*, and of *barren souls*; and if it be true what Mr. Huntington declares of his sermon, as I really believe it is, he certainly is *barren of light and life*.

The term "consecrated bowl of negus" is certainly unscriptural; but as there are several living witnesses that my Father took that particular from what he saw, and others heard, in a certain vestry, which his candour would never

have led him to make public, if the jovial company had not brought him in at every turn, as the Philistines did Samson, *to make sport* for the combination. All that Mr. H. has said about his qualifications for slander, and disqualifications for the ministry, he has proved in his book; and those that are conversant with him may easily prove the same by his conduct; therefore you ought to make a distinction, as Paul did, between a *labourer in the vineyard*, and those *that serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies*. There is a material difference between a labourer in the vineyard, and a *little fox that spoils the vines*, Cant. ii. 15. Mr. Huntington has never denied, but published to the world, what he was as a sinner, and what by profession—a *coal-beaver*, a *cobler*, and a *gardener*, &c. He might add, a sinner saved—and I add, an excellent divine. He has published also how he was called of God, how commissioned, and how sent out to preach: nor did he run from his profession of coal-heaving, &c. without a call from God as the plasterer did; but abode in his laborious calling, and went on with his ministry, till it pleased God to employ him fully in his vineyard. Therefore you ought not to compare such a man to an uncommissioned *dauber with untempered mortar*, who has started from the hod, uncalled, unqualified, unsent, unordained, into the affected orders of an established divine; and made a confession in a
public

public court of judicature, that he was the Reverend Mr. C. of *Clare Hall, Cambridge*, when he only strutted about there (with a three cornered hat) for a few days, till they found him out. 'Tis well known that he has never given any account to the church of God, either of his conversion to God, or of his mission or commission from him, nor of his qualification from *Clare Hall*; unless you call his shameful detection, and dismissal from thence, his taking up his degrees as a master of arts. If you can justify such a man as this (for publicly slandered those that you own are sent of God) just for the sake of picking up a few pence, you are one of Solomon's pliable ones, *that for one morsel of bread would transgress.*

I cannot see any fault in Mr. H.'s treatment of him, considering he has ridiculed him for so many years for want of school learning (and many times in my hearing), when Mr. H. has proved him as ignorant of grammar as himself; and I believe he is a perfect stranger to the divine teachings of God's spirit, which alone can make a man a minister of Christ, seeing they are called *ministers of the Spirit, not of the letter; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life, 2 Cor. iii. 6.*

I see no great fault in Mr. H.'s attempt to shave the downy beards of his young accusers. To you it may appear strange, but to me it seems scriptural; and I take it for granted that he

B

meant

meant it in a spiritual sense. *And thou, son of man, take thee a sharp knife, take thee a barber's razor, and cause it to pass upon thine head, and upon thy beard; then take thee balances to weigh, and divide the hair. Thou shalt burn with fire a third part in the midst of the city, when the days of the siege are fulfilled; and thou shalt take a third part, and smite about it with a knife; and a third part thou shalt scatter into the wind, and I will draw out a sword after them. Thou shalt also take thereof a few in number, and bind them in thy skirts. Thus saith the Lord God, This is Jerusalem, Ezek. v. 1—6.* These few hairs which were ordered to be shaved from the head and face, and hid in the *skirt*, I presume, Madam, hold forth the *elect* of God, who are to be cut off from all confidence in the flesh, or in the fleshly arm of another, and *bound up in the skirts* of the ever blessed Son of man, whose type Ezekiel was, by his twofold office, as a priest and prophet. And perhaps Mr. H. was apprehensive that some of these chosen hairs, being weak in faith, might stick to the Plasterer's assumed robe, instead of flying into the Saviour's skirt. He might think it his duty to exercise the *sword of the Spirit*, or the *barber's razor*, for the same purpose that Ezekiel did. Not that I believe there is the least danger of destroying those for whom Christ died; nor do I believe it is in Mr. H.'s power, deal as faithful as he may, to stop those that run before they are sent; for wisdom

dom says, that *graceless men will rage and be confident, when the righteous look well to their way.*

Query 9. Whether a man who can give no account of the power of religion, either in his writing or preaching, nor any evidence of it in his life and conversation, can be said to know any thing of the *new man*; and if not, whether Mr. Huntington be to blame, for advising him to "let that just man alone?" seeing 'twas a part of Job's folly and confession both, *that he uttered things that he understood not, things too wonderful for him, Job xlii. 3.*

Query 10. Mr. H. has proved his accuser ignorant of, and a stranger to, the power of both law and gospel, and consequently ignorant of himself; and as this is made plain in the *Modern Plasterer Detected*, can he be charged any more with blame for telling him of it, than Jude, who called such preachers *fruitless trees, raging waves, and sensual men, having not the spirit.* And as he cannot prove that God ever sent him, it is no more a crime in Mr. H. to expose him, than it was in Paul, when he called such men *ministers of Satan.* Nor can you prove, that graceless macaronies, or *carnal men*, walking in the fashions of the world, have any right to "*mount a rostrum,*" or, if you please, to ascend a pulpit, according to the *English phrase*; for I suppose you are not acquainted with the Latin word *rostrum*: if you had, you would not have produced that as a

fault in the preacher, who, under the mask of Candour, you secretly intend to injure.

Query 11. Whether Mr. H. can be charged with want of candour, for calling one of his slanderers “ the Reverend Mr. Belly,” more than Paul was, for calling *the Cretians liars, evil beasts, slow bellies*, Titus i. 12. seeing Mr. Belly did bely Mr. H. in the pulpit, in the hearing of many witnesses; and my brother owned to me, in the presence of Mr. Terry, that Mr. Huntington was the man Mr. Belly levelled his discourse at; which Mr. B. has since denied: therefore my spiritual father might justly call him, as Paul did the Cretians, a *liar*, an *evil beast*, and one of a *slow belly*; and might justly add, *this witness is true; therefore rebuke them sharply*.

Query 12. Whether “ ranking an adversary “ among those birds that are not worth a charge,” be any more a sin with Mr. H. than in the Spouse, who begged *that the little foxes might be taken*; which must be done by shooting at them with God’s bow, or taking them in his trap? and whether the name sparrow, applied to a railer, be any worse than the name fox, wolf, or hypocrite, who attempts to pick *motes out of the eyes* of others, when he has so many *beams in his own*? and whether this imprudent, nay, impetuous step of yours, in *usurping authority over the man*, and assuming the highest office, where your subjection and silence is demanded, be not likely

to be attended with as bad consequences, as the rebellion of *Vashti*; who, by her breaking her marriage-covenant by disobedience, and disdain compliance with the royal command of her sovereign and husband, was likely to endanger the head both of the king and his nobles, by her bad example set before the ladies of Persia, until their aspiring hopes were dashed, by a new act of toleration granted to the men, according to the council of *Memucan*, the chief speaker in that house of peers, Esth. i. If her disloyalty and disobedience to an earthly sovereign was so dangerous both to the king and his subjects, what must yours be, who have transgressed all the divine and positive commands of the *King of kings*? and, without either warrant or precedent, have presumed to contradict the charge of a whole society of Evangelists (which you have done by declaring Mr. H. no Antinomian), and presuming to teach even the ambassador of the King of Heaven (as you say Mr. H. is sent of God). These proceedings are a scandal to *Hephi-zibab*, and a bad example to the young *princes*, I mean *the virgin daughters of Sion*. O fy, fy, this is *Mara de Fleury* indeed—*bitterness in bloom*. A thousand pities it were not ripe in the bud!

Query 13. Whether a combination of men, who meet together for the purpose of preaching, disputing, and railing against others, as is clearly stated in the Plasterer, who make sport of the

fervants of God—calling them air-balloons, which to my certain knowledge the secretary of that society has done, &c. may not be as justly called a club, a combination, or a spouting club, as a disputing club. By Isaiah it is called [an unlawful] *confederacy*, and by David, a *company of hypocritical mockers*. Neither *spouts* nor *clubs* are unscriptural expressions. David speaks of *water spouts*, and Solomon speaks of *mauls*, or clubs, which *tale-bearers* make use of to knock people at head in the dark.

Now, Madam, you come with your hypocritical appeal. “ These few extracts may serve for
 “ a specimen of the whole, and they are sufficient
 “ for me to ground this question upon—Is this
 “ the spirit of the gospel? does this language be-
 “ come the seriousness and dignity of a minister
 “ of Jesus Christ?” To which I answer, I have already proved by this mode of yours, you might represent the Bible in a worse light than Mr. H.’s pamphlet. I have also proved that you might represent the blessed Saviour himself, and all his apostles, in a worse light also, if you pass over all the doctrines of the Bible, as you have done the doctrines of the above pamphlet, and cull out only the appellations and threatenings which the scriptures level at slanderers and false preachers. I further add, that these extracts of yours, which you call *rudeness*, *spleen*, *bitterness*, and *rancour*, are scripture phrases, except the words surplus,

plus, gown, cassock, negus, and the word gun, which you may call agreeable to scripture—*strong drink, and bows and arrows.* As you have ridiculed Mr. H. for making use of scriptural expressions (where he has proved them applicable), I ask if you don't fall under Paul's double charge—*If any teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he (or she) is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions, and strife of words, whereof cometh strifes, railings, and evil surmisings,* 1 Tim. vi. 3, 4. I much suspect that you are one of Paul's *doters*, that know nothing of power; for I observed, as soon as I read your letter, not knowing the author, that he or she was a stranger to the divine power of religion. The other charge of Paul is, that *women keep silence, not pretend to teach, nor usurp authority over the man,* which you pay no regard to. I must remind you again of my motto. These things seem to be out of sight, and out of mind with you. It is in vain that you recommend any divine rule to others, while you break through the positive bounds that God has set, in every line you wrote. *Cast out your own beam, and then you will see the mote.* God never sent a minister of his to be taught by a woman; nor did he ever give any woman a command to teach a gospel minister. 'Tis true, Saul went to the *witch of Endor* for instruction; but it was not till the Lord

refused to answer him, either by *dream, Urim, or prophet*, 1 Sam. xxviii. 6. and should this be the case with my father, I dare say he will petition you to divine for him. But at present he cannot be persuaded that any soul can be a partaker of the grace of God, or have the fear of him before their eyes, that can publicly break through the bounds of God's positive command, and presumptuously assume the place of the *Great Prophet* of the church, who has promised to give a mouth and wisdom to all his ministers.

Query 14. If a minister be as you assert a dignified character, and you allow Mr. Huntington to be one of that character, as your letter expresses, whether women, who are so often commanded to be silent, subject, and never to *usurp authority over the man*, can from the word of God be justified, in thus presuming, dictating, and commanding these dignified officers to *prophecy smooth things, to prophecy deceits*, and to leave erroneous and abusive men in quiet possession of their errors, and hypocritical professors in quiet possession of their ways, under the notion of being *meek and gentle towards all men*? and whether women have any warrant from God's book to pretend to *search the hearts and try the reins* of faithful ministers, and to attempt to prove them, as you have done, "acting from principles of rancour and spleen within;" seeing God has declared it is their duty to *use sharpness* as well as gentleness;

gentleness; God says, that *those that can abase the proud, and tread down the wicked, shall be saved by their own hand*, Job xl. 11—14.

I hope, Madam, you will not be offended at my queries, since it is done from a pure disinterested love to Mr. Huntington, whom I have the greatest cause to esteem, from the wonders God has done for my soul by his instrumentality; and as I judged that you wanted employment for an idle hour, as well as to make a penny, and cut something of a flourish in the world as an authoress, I thought I would employ your leisure time, and take the burden from my father's back (indeed your letter seems much beneath his attention), seeing there is a combination of twenty-four to one against him already; besides, an evangelic association, whose *characters* you affirm to be established in the churches, and whose weapons you say are spiritual, can never stand in need of a female tongue or pen to fight for them; much less as the *Lord's host*, or a company of *good soldiers*, would they fly for refuge, or take sanctuary in a woman's *gown tail*. There was no call for acknowledging that you was not one of the Evangelic Association, though 'tis a thousand pities but you was, as it consists chiefly of old women; yet if you had, no experienced christian would have thought you an evangelist, for you know neither law nor gospel with respect to the power of it. If the law was

to come to you as it did to Paul, sin would revive, and you would die to sin, and not break the commands as you do, in pretending to teach, when you ought to be silent. It is to be feared you are *alive without the law*, as you pay so little regard to the gospel; besides, what person would have thought of a woman's joining an association of evangelists? we read of *Pope Joan*, but I never read of *Pope Maria* among the Cardinals that I remember.

Query 15. Whether your charge against Mr. Huntington of *rudeness, spleen, rancour, bitterness*,—guilty of *error*, not knowing the believer's rule, nor the law as a covenant of works, from the law as a rule;—these things you have brought against Mr. H. whom you own is a minister of Christ in your letter; I say, is not your charge against him as God's servant more reprehensible than his charge against railers, false accusers, and false teachers? if so, don't you judge another man's servant? which is the thing you forbid in him; are you not guilty of the same thing that you blame in him? then who is the most culpable—he for doing his duty, in *trying them that say they are apostles and are not*, or you in your rebellion against the command of God, which tells you *not to teach*, not to *usurp authority*, but to be in *silence—physician, heal thyself*. Those that set themselves up for reprovers, or prescribers of rules to others, ought to stand clear of disobedience,

dience, lest when they cast their pearls to a supposed *swine*, *he turn again and rend them*.

Query 16. Whether the words *spleen*, *rancour*, *rudeness*, *bitterness*, and *oh fie fie*, which you produce as the fruits of your candour, do not sound as harsh as the names "Simon Magus and Alexander the coppersmith," which you call the effects of Mr. Huntington's spleen? and whether if Mr. H. was to say of you "that the devil had stirred you up to ridicule his character, and injure his ministry," it could be either condemned or disapproved, seeing the word of God in my motto so strictly and repeatedly tells you *not to teach, not to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence*; yea, that *it is even a shame for a woman to speak*. As God's word forbids it, and you make manifest your disobedience thereto, the devil must have set you at it, and you proclaim your rebellion, Madam, which according to my motto says, *a woman shall not teach, nor usurp authority over the man*.

I shall now take a paragraph from your candid performance, the subject on which you wrote:
 " It is impossible to form any proper idea of the
 " sermon on which you so largely comment, as
 " the Evangelical Association have not yet published it; you have retailed a part of it to us
 " in scraps, but I could as easily form a judgment by a few mangled limbs covered with
 " blood and mire torn from a dead body, whether
 " ther

“ ther the person when living was handsome or
 “ not, as pronounce on the merit of this sermon
 “ from the deranged fragments you have laid
 “ before us.”

One would think by this paragraph that you were a lady of the faculty, as well as a mistress of arts and a teacher of divinity; and that you had got all your doctrines at Surgeons Hall; for although there is no more favour of divinity in your letter than there is in the white of an egg, nor any more account of the power of religion than what Dol Bridget or Mother Shipton could give, yet you seem to know something of mangled limbs, and the manner of drawing them from the dead body. How came you so well acquainted with mangled limbs? *seek not the living among the dead*—the Saviour is not here, *he is risen*; give not way to that low spirit that speaks and mutters out of the dust.

Query 17. Whether this candid harangue from a rebellious woman, who is commanded to be in silence, according to my motto, does not look as much like spleen, and as unscriptural, as any fragment she has extracted from the MODERN PLASTERER DETECTED? and whether it is possible to put together a consistent body of divinity, from an inconsistent jumble of falsehood? and whether Mr. Huntington can be more blamed for transcribing above half a fourpenny sermon of palpable falsehood levelled at his character in
 his

his book, than you can, who have extracted only about four pages from a shilling pamphlet of sound and excellent divinity? You need not have charged Mr. H. with "*deranging* of the sermon," for there was no arrangement in it; nor did I know what the preacher would be at when I heard it preached, nor those that were with me, who were much better judges than myself; 'twas darkening council by words without knowledge indeed, for we understood nothing but the text:—as for the preacher he did not understand that; Mr. H. is therefore justifiable in saying that he was a stranger to the new man, and he is equally so by saying he knew nothing of the old, for he could give no account of the battles, warrings, strugglings and contentions between the company of *two armies* the spouse speaks of in the Canticles.

Another quotation of yours,—“ Now if this
 “ promise be fulfilled to you, and the railing
 “ you so plentifully bestow upon others be re-
 “ turned into your own bosom, it will make
 “ your ears tingle.”

Query 18. According to the text that you quote in the above paragraph, who is the object that is to receive the plentiful return? Does it not fall to his share, who dealt the first measure? and who were they, but those that in the public pulpit charged Mr. H. with *a thirst for blood*? with taking texts that modest men would blush
 at,

at, and sensible men be ashamed of, with Antinomianism, with sophistry, &c. &c. I heard these things myself, and that with grief of heart; because I had felt so much of the power of God under Mr. H.'s ministry, which I shall never attribute to him, but to his God, from whom the power came, which I believe will end in my eternal salvation; and I add, if the church of God at large knew how that Plasterer, and several others of the combination, had ridiculed, scoffed, railed, sported, and jested about Mr. H. in my hearing—*upright men would be astonished at it, and the innocent would stir up himself against the hypocrite*, Job xvii. 8. You own yourself that Mr. H. is sent of God to preach, and that he is no Antinomian. If so, has he not a just right to vindicate his testimony and character against such accusations, according to your own rule? You'll pardon my warmth, Madam; for I am zealously affected to Mr. H. to his life, walk, conversation, and ministry, and have the greatest reason of any one living so to be, as he was the instrument, under God, of bringing me to my present state of bliss and happiness; on which account I cannot endure to see my poor father in Christ hen-pecked by a woman, whose writings are so destitute of that *savoury meat* that young heirs of promise are so fond of. I tried hard in my letters to prove Mr. H. erroneous, as well as you; but his weighty and powerful answers soon convinced me

me that I was wrong, and that the power was of God; and this letter of yours as fully convinces me that you are not right, because you are guilty of all that you reprove in him.

Another quotation from yours—"The subject
" is important, and, if I understand the preacher
" right, Sir, you have most grossly misunder-
" stood him." And I think you have most
grossly misunderstood, and falsely interpreted Mr.
H.'s reply to the Plasterer; for as the sermon on
the law established by faith, published by Mr. H.
was bought and attempted to be dissected from
the pulpit by the Plasterer, who preached from
Mr. H.'s text, and as the establishment of the
law was the principal point that was to be
handled, and Mr. H.'s establishment of the law
to be overthrown by the Plasterer; Mr. Hunt-
ington therefore culled out every basis of the
Plasterer's discourse on which he had fixed the
law, and published them to the church at large,
as it was publicly levelled at him (which was
absolutely the case, for the Plasterer declared to
me since, that he "did it out of kindness to the
man," which he must perfectly well remember,
nor can he deny it, unless he chuses to give
conscience the lie); it was levelled also at his
sermon quoted and plundered by him, and some
of it delivered as his own doctrine. In short,
Madam, they both handled one text;—the basis
on which Mr. H. established the law is now in
2 print;

print;—the basis on which the Plasterer established his against Mr. H.'s antinomianism are in print also, and are fairly quoted and published verbatim; now the query is, whether one of my father's bases is overthrown, and whether one of the Plasterer's bases is according to truth; Mr. H. says he can defend his own, and has proved every one of the Plasterer's to be unscriptural; if so, who is in the error? He well knows, and so do the whole combination, that the "**MODERN PLASTERER DETECTED**" is unanswerable upon their principles, therefore silence best becomes them, as the scriptures will not afford them either shelter or encouragement; nevertheless I should not be surprised if they treat it with private reproach, or say it is not worth their notice; Solomon says, *A fool, if he boldeth his peace, shall be esteemed wise*; and if you defend what cannot be proved, and oppose what cannot be overthrown, none but the accuser of the brethren, and father of lies, will approve your candour.

The Plasterer never once mentioned the law in the *heart of the Surety*; he never once mentioned the *law going forth out of Zion*: he never described what the law was in a believer's heart; therefore, whether he meant the law as a covenant of works, or as a *rule of conduct*, the matter lays here—are any one of the Plasterer's bases, on which he established the law, agreeable to God's word? my Father declares they are not, and 'tis the

the Plasterer's business to *prove him a liar* (if he can), and *make his speech nothing worth*, Job xxiv. 25. and if he cannot (which conscience tells him is really the case, for a good soldier of Jesus Christ will ever stand forth with boldness in the defence of truth), I see no reason why a minister of Christ should be hen-pecked (for you can call it no better) by a woman, for defending his own testimony and character: I must remind you once more of my motto—*I permit not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence*. My Father has no objection to the Plasterer's publishing his own sermon, so as 'tis agreeable to the original one; and if he is called upon in vindication of his own character, he has no objection to publish and dissect another sermon delivered by the Plasterer, in order to prove to the church at large that he neither knows the truth nor preaches it.

Another quotation from yours: "I am far, Sir, from thinking you an Antinomian, but I believe your error lies here, you do not distinguish between the law as a covenant of works, and as a rule of the believer's conduct." I am sorry to think that a man, disciplined by the law for upwards of twenty years, and delivered with so high a hand, sent out by the great Prophet of the Church, and used to the conversion and establishment of so many hundred souls, should be so ignorant. Surely the Saviour has not fulfilled his promise, or the Spirit's teaching

C

must

must be very deficient in my Father, that he is to learn the last part of his ministry at the feet of a schoolmistress. I think you find fault with Mr. H. for sending the "Plasterer for a lesson to a schoolmistress," when you at the same time assume the office by sending lessons to him: I must not only remind you of my motto, but return the old proverb—*Physician, heal thyself.*

The dispute that some time ago took place, and has been long held with my Father, is this: Whether the ten commandments alone be the believers only all-sufficient rule of life, exclusive of all other scriptures as a part of that rule, or whether the whole revealed will of God be the believers rule, which whole revealed will includes the law; my Father insists on the latter, and the man that first begun the dispute with him insists on the former; this is the dispute which your Excellency is to settle.

In the last scrap that I quoted from yours, you tell Mr. Huntington that you have found out "where his error lays;" now as you have found it out, your next business is to disentangle him, and 'tis to be hoped that you will do it with some account of that spiritual walk which alone can be consistent with the law, *the carnal mind being enmity to God—not subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be; you know the oracles aver, that those that walk in the spirit shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.*

Query

Query 19. Now suppose that what Mr. Huntington's adversaries have asserted be true, that the ten commandments alone, exclusive of the preceptive parts of scripture, be the believer's only rule of life, then what will you do with Paul's rule—*As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ; for neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law, but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh. But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.* Gal. vi. 12—16. Again, read the third chapter of Paul to the Philippians, where he commands joy in the Lord—and commends true circumcision—a worshipping of God in the spirit, a rejoicing in Jesus Christ—a counting all things but loss for Christ, that he may be found in him—that he might know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, by a conformity to his death, that he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead, for the which he apprehended the Saviour, and the Saviour apprehended him; after which he pressed forward, and aimed at the mark that secures the prize; let as many as are perfect be thus minded; and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even

this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same things, Philip. iii. 16.

Here lies your difficulty, Madam; whether the ten commandments of themselves be the believer's only rule of life, as Mr. Huntington's first opposer declared they were; and if you agree with him, and say yes, then I ask what you will do with these rules of Paul? but if you answer, according to this part of your letter, "We ought not in order to establish one glorious truth strike out another," and affirm, that the ten commands are not to be established as the believer's only rule, so as to exclude Paul's gospel rule, and other parts of scripture, then you are an Antinomian as well as Mr. Huntington, by holding the sentiments of his sermon, which declares the whole revealed will of God to be the believer's rule of life, and not the ten commandments only. Your answer to this must be expressive of your judgment on this point; before which determination, it will be necessary for you to consider, whether you do not take many unwarrantable steps in your gospel profession (I will not say possession), that are not to be found in the ten commandments. No man can say that Mr. Huntington ever asserted that we are without the law of love to God, or that we are not under the law (of love and obedience) to Christ; nor can they say he lives a lawless life.

I would

I would to God that the Plasterer, and others that accuse him, lived and laboured in as disinterested a way as he does. He has ever enforced obedience both to God and Christ: 1st. from God's everlasting love to his elect;—2dly, from a spiritual union with Christ, without which the branch can bring forth no fruit of itself;—3dly, from the promise of God's love never being taken from the elect;—4thly, from the Spirit's work on the soul—we are to serve in the newness of the spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter;—5thly, from God's promise of putting his fear and writing his laws on the hearts of the elect—I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them, Ezek. xxxvi. 27. 6thly, from God's promise to work in his people both to will and to do of his own good pleasure;—7thly, from a walk in the spirit—walk in the spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh;—8thly, from the immutability of God's love, which when enjoyed is the fulfilling of the law—who shall separate us from the love of God;—and lastly, from the promise of their safe arrival in heaven, who follow Christ in the regeneration.

Enforcing obedience from these things he thinks is preaching the gospel—doing the work of an evangelist, and magnifying the office of a minister of the spirit, much more than setting the law perpetually before the children of God as their only rule of life; but as the above spiri-

tual points cannot be handled nor described by men destitute of the spirit and of gospel experience, they are obliged to *turn aside to vain jangling, or to the ministry of the letter, though they know not what they say, nor whereof they affirm.*—This, Madam, is the Antinomianism that Mr. Huntington preaches, lives, and enjoys, and the good effects of it is visible on his congregation, *who are known and read of all men, as living epistles*—not legal workmongers; and if the above evangelical method will not produce evangelical obedience, enforcing the letter is not likely to do it. I bless God for Mr. H.'s Antinomianism, as some call it; and I bless God for his life and conversation, which has never staggered me, as the vain and trifling conversation of the Plasterer has done, and others also who belong to that combination.

Another quotation from yours—"Let us embrace the whole truth; every part of truth is precious, and not to be parted with." In these words you have established all that my Father has said; these assertions of yours overthrow all that his adversaries have levelled at him;—why surely you know not what you are about? If every truth is to be embraced, then the whole will of God is the Christian's rule, and all that Christ commands is to be obeyed, though it cannot be found in the ten commands; for they reveal not the Saviour, nor do they direct to faith, nor trust
in

in another for life. If you don't take care you will appear an Huntingtonian to all intents and purposes. You are *running*, but 'tis at an *uncertainty*; you are *fighting*, but you only *beat the air*; however, as it comes from one of the weaker sex, who according to my motto *is not to teach, but to be in silence*, it is hoped it will be overlooked, as my Father is a man of *candour*.

I admire your prayer, "What we know not
 " may He teach us; and what we do know may
 " He enable us to adorn, by shewing forth a good
 " conversation in all the meekness of wisdom."
 But the thing is, they that give laws should keep them; and can you be said to adorn the truth by assuming *to teach and usurp*, when the truth itself charges you not to do it? Can rebellion against it be called adorning of it? Can you condemn the conversation of the man you oppose? Is there any meekness in all your raillery against him, and the errors you have falsely accused him of? Is there any wisdom in your quoting a page or two of scraps out of his book, just to injure his ministry, without taking notice of any one truth in all the book? Will you call rebellion, railing, hypocrisy, and an attempt to slander and injure the minister and ministry of truth, "adorning of it in meekness and wisdom?"

Another quotation from yours—"The law, as
 " a covenant of works, has nothing to do with
 " the believer in Jesus." I never heard Mr.

Huntington say so much against the law in my life; *you do not plow with his beifer, and therefore you cannot find out his riddle.* I believe the law, as a covenant of works, commands love to God and the neighbour, and the gospel reveals and gives this love; without the application of which no flesh can be saved (agreeable to Mr. Huntington's doctrine). And further, the law commands good works;—and God works in the believer both to will and to do them.

Another quotation from yours: “It cannot
 “curse the believer, because his Surety has re-
 “deemed him from its curse, by bearing it him-
 “self in his own body on the cross. It has no
 “commanding power over him, because it is
 “completely fulfilled, magnified and made ho-
 “nourable by Jehovah our Righteousness.”—
 This is as bad Antinomianism as any Mr. Huntington is accused of, but you do not see the law in the heart of the surety as he does. You say the
 “believer longs to have the law written upon his heart,” but my Father insists upon it, that a man is not a believer, nor sensibly brought into the bonds of the covenant, until the whole of the law is written upon his heart by the spirit of the living God. My Father does not deny the “perfection of the law,” nor its being a glorious transcript of God's will, but he says 'tis not the whole of his will; for there are perfections shining in the face of Christ that never shone in the law;

law; and therefore the ten commandments are not to be exalted, to the exclusion of the rest of the Bible, or the commands of the Saviour.

You say the " whole life of the Saviour was " spent in obedience to the law, and that it was " a rule by which he squared all his thoughts, " words, and actions." I answer, the Saviour had his sheep to gather, his gospel to preach, his kingdom to found, his people to redeem, the conditions of the new covenant to perform, as well as the precepts of the old to obey; so the believer has a Saviour to believe, a salvation to work out, a cross to bear, an imputed righteousness to seek, grace and strength to fetch in, and a path in the regeneration to find, though the ten commands say nothing about it. Though the Saviour had the law to fulfil, yet it was not all that he had to do; the whole of his heavenly father's WILL was his RULE, and not a part thereof; all was fulfilled that was WRITTEN *in the LAW, in the PROPHETS, and in the PSALMS concerning him.—I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* As you talk so much about the law and the spirit, I wish you would in your next publication send an account of the force and killing power of the law on you, as Paul did; for there are many that talk about it, who are *alive without the law*, as Paul once was; and what the sweet, enlarging, comforting, and constraining operations of the Spirit are; *I don't want*

want to know the speech of them that are puffed up, but the power—for the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.

I never heard Mr. Huntington say we are not under the law of love and holiness to Christ Jesus; but he insists on the law being in the Surety's heart; and on the law of love and holiness in the constraining power of the spirit on the believer's mind; and all other persons he takes to be pharisees, or loose livers, notwithstanding all their outcry about the law as the only rule of life, and all their rancour and malice against others as Antinomians. I know Mr. Huntington has got *Wilsius on the Covenants*, because he has offered to give them away; not out of any dislike to the sound words of them, but because the author treats so little about that power that he had rather die than lose the blessed and feeling sense of, without the assistance of which, I firmly believe, he would act as bad as you do, who enforce rules for others, and charge them with errors, while you are guilty of absolute rebellion yourself, according to my motto, which is, *I permit not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence*. Truth hath averred, that those who are disobedient, are to every good word and work reprobate; and the former is what he condemns in you, because you give no account of the terrors of the law on your own heart, as Paul did, nor
of

of the delivering, constraining, and comforting power of the Holy Ghost upon the soul, which the real believer enjoys; and without which he can never live to the honour of God, live above the world, nor see his interest clear in covenant.

Mr. Huntington is not ashamed of his life or conduct before men: He has never wrote against any man, till they began first to slander him; he is no hackney writer, nor does he eat the bread of idleness, nor act as you do—give rules for others, and break them yourself, according to my motto. This imperious, accusing, designing, unsavory letter of yours, puts me in mind of some discourses that were levelled at me, on purpose to convert me from Popery, which in reality only served to establish me, because they could not touch my troubled mind; and like some that I have heard since, where there was a deal of blind zeal about the law, but such poor, unmeaning, insipid, and confused descriptions of grace, and of the Spirit's constraining power on the soul, that they rather stirred up enmity, than excited my love and gratitude to God; and for my part, I must confess, where I have felt the most power, there I have seen the most holiness; for 'tis neither the hearers nor the preachers of the law are just before God—but *the doers of the law shall be justified*; and he that enjoys a powerful union with Christ will be the best doer at last. I wish you would desire either Mr. Belly, or the Plasterer,

terer, to publish an experimental treatise on a *vital union with Christ*, and of a *walk in the Spirit*, with an appeal to God, that it is written out of their own hearts; then we should see a noble performance, well becoming an Evangelical Association.

I must now attempt a discovery of what you would, as an imperious woman, an aspiring character, an hackney writer (that will undertake any subject), be glad to conceal—namely, your hypocrisy; which appears sixfold.—Your hypocrisy to God,—to his word,—to your own conscience,—to your allies, or the Association that encourage you,—to the cause of God,—and to Mr. Huntington.

First, your hypocrisy to God: you assert, that “you do not question Mr. H.’s being called of God, both as a Christian and as a preacher,” and yet have done all that in your power lays to represent him as *erroneous*, in order to hurt his usefulness, and prejudice people’s minds against him.—If you reproach the Lord’s ambassador, you reproach the King of Zion—who *you own* has sent him.—*He that despiseth whomsoever I send, despiseth me.*

Your hypocrisy with the word of truth.—You passed over in silence every doctrine that is cleared in Mr. Huntington’s book, and culled out what you hoped would countenance your hypocrisy. I have proved, that you might by the
same

same method represent the Bible itself in as bad a light.—You are commanded to *prove all things, and hold fast that which is good*.—Instead of that, you have *fed upon the ashes*:—*a deceived heart has turned you aside*,

Your hypocrisy to your own conscience.—If it was in favour of truth, why did you pass over in silence every truth in Mr. H.'s book? and if conscience justified your proceedings, that you was vindicating good men, in a good cause, and opposing of a proud, bitter, *erroneous* man, and that God's word warranted your proceedings against him, why did you not put your name to the *prude system*?—But being conscious of your hypocritical intention, and fearing some honest neighbour might discover your hypocrisy, you judged it most proper to conceal it,

Your hypocrisy to your allies.—You have pretended to write in vindication of the combination's proceedings against Mr. H.; you have vindicated their honour, asserted their usefulness, and their established reputation in the ministry and in the churches, and yet under colour you have represented these very men in a scandalous point of light.—One of those men that you vindicate, called Mr. H. an Antinomian in the public pulpit (and himself confessed to me in conversation, he was really the man he alluded to), others of the combination prayed over the discourse, and the rest approved it by countenancing
of

of it.—But you say you are “ far from thinking him an Antinomian.” If your assertion be true, what must the public charge of the others be, but a false accusation and a slander; and if you are right, are they not all wrong? Thus you have publicly contradicted the public charge of above twenty evangelists, and proved them false accusers, under a candourous pretension of vindicating of them.

Another asserted, that he was a man of such a spirit, that he would swim this metropolis with blood.—This was done to represent him a “ child of him that was a *murderer from the beginning*.”—You say no; you have no doubt of Mr. H.’s being called of God, both as a Christian and as a preacher.—Is this thy kindness to thy friends?—“ Oh fie! fie!”—But this is not at all to be wondered at: for I am informed that your conscience will let you write on any subject.—You can pen a treatise on the words of divinity, though not on the power; write a poem on candour, or an history of anatomy or the dissection of mangled limbs.

Your hypocrisy in the cause of God.—You have, contrary to your intentions, proved Mr. H.’s accusers above mentioned, to have borne a false witness against him.—What will those many hundred people think who heard those charges brought in against Mr. H., when they come to read your crude thoughts?—Will they not say

that those gentlemen were false apostles, or deceitful workers, for laying those charges on him; or else that you are lifted up in the pride of Satan or the infallibility of a Pope, in presuming to contradict and overthrow the charges of upwards of twenty evangelists.

Your hypocrisy to Mr. Huntington.—You tell him that he is *no Antinomian*, and yet charge him with *Antinomian principles*.—You believe him to be *called and sent of God*, and yet charge him with rancour, spleen, and bitterness, for doing his office, and vindicating his testimony.—You recommend candour to him, and heap *slander on him*.—How strangely do those entangle themselves in difficulties, that meddle with religious matters while destitute of the power thereof.

According to your judgment of a minister's stature, "Mr. H. is too big by one-half." You say he is called and sent of God to preach; if so, he is, according to God's word, set in the highest office, for there is no office above a minister of Christ in the church. Ministers whom God sends are officers or servants of the highest order in God's household; and pray what office have you assumed, or to what height or size have you aspired, who are positively commanded *not to teach, not to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence*; nay, that it is even a shame for a woman to teach; yet you have broken through all bounds; and not contented with the highest office,

office, namely that of a teacher, you are become a teacher of teachers; for you have publicly contradicted, and exposed to contempt, upwards of twenty evangelists; and though you condemn Mr. H. for sending the Plasterer to a schoolmistress for a lesson, yet you have called Mr. H. to your foot, and have set him many lessons; you have reprov'd him, corrected him, chastised him, instructed him, ridiculed him, and counselled him; yea, and even disputed his size, and told him how much is to be pared off; and yet you say he is called and sent of God.—If ministers are dignified characters, as you affirm, and persons in the highest office, you are higher than the highest officers.—No wonder Mr. H. is lifted up in his office when you set him so bad an example.—Oh fy, fy, fy!—If he be too big by one half as a minister, you are certainly as an usurper too big by all the four quarters.

In order to magnify your office, and quit yourself with honour in this business, which you had need to do, for you will surely be criticized, the following difficulties will devolve upon you, which you will be expected to make your reply to, and that with truth on your side. Don't put me off with a few empty, unmeaning, unscriptural phrases—such as *crude thoughts*, *mangled limbs*, and *candour*, which mean any thing, or nothing, just as the partial or villainous author pleases to construe them; these are refuges of lies, that hypo-

hypocrites fly to, when beat out of their false holds by the light and force of truth.—I know the sense of words as well as you do; and though I do not expect humour, witticisms, nor savour from you, for though *wisdom dwells with prudence, and finds out knowledge of witty inventions*, yet wisdom dwells not with the *imperious*, but *resists the proud* and *beholds them afar off*.—Clear the following difficulties by *Scripture*, and back them with the *wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ*, that we may know who has got truth on their side—they that have truth on their side, have God on their side.

First, in order to vindicate your allies, you must prove from the word of God, that an Association of Evangelists are warranted to call Mr. H. (who you say is sent of God) “an air balloon filled with inflammable air, that will mount up to heaven, and then fall and burst to pieces.”—“That he takes texts that good men would shudder at, and modest men blush at.”—“That he is a man of such a spirit, that he would swim this metropolis with blood.”—“That he is a modern Antinomian, a sophist, a cunning one, a player with arguments.”—These things were said of him to my knowledge, without any offence given by Mr. H.—You must by scripture justify these assertions, or give up your confession, (*viz.*) that Mr. H. is called and sent of God.

Difficulty 2d. You must prove that Mr. H. has no right to vindicate his character or ministry, nor to give a public rebuke, though he be publicly slandered; that *those that sin openly, are not to be openly rebuked*; that the Saviour's woe falls not upon him through whom the offence (or slander) cometh, but upon the slandered, whom God has called and sent.—And that the additional *measure promised to the first meter* is to be heaped upon the head of the innocent sufferer; though God says, he will *surely requite*—and men are commanded to *deal* as they would be *dealt* with.

Difficulty 3d. You must prove that the Plasterer's establishment of the law, or his various bases, are agreeable to the word of God. They are fairly quoted, and published as he delivered them; which I am witness to, as I was present when the sermon was preached.

Difficulty 4th. You must prove that Mr. H. is in an error about the law as a rule of life, according to your assertion; which if it be an error, you have established it, though I believe you did not intend so to do.—Mr. H.'s first opposer said, the Ten Commandments are the believers only rule of life.—Mr. H. says, the whole revealed will of God is his rule; you say the same.—“ We are not to put down one truth and set up another, but to embrace the *whole* truth.”—Mr. H. says, we are predestinated, redeemed, adopted, and saved, according to God's sovereign will; that
all

all our inward and outward crosses and trials are to be laid to the rule of our heavenly Father's will.—*This is the will of God concerning us.*—Mr. H. asserts, that Christ's voice is to be obeyed, whether it be found in the Ten Commandments or not: you say the same.—“ The preceptive part of Scripture is the believer's rule of conduct.”—Mr. H. says, the believer is delivered from the commanding and condemning power of the law, as a covenant of works, which commands doing for life.—You say, “ the believer has nothing to do with the law, it has no commanding power over him; nor can it condemn him, because it is magnified by Jehovah our Righteousness, who also bore the curse of it.” Mr. H. says, the believer has got both his law and his gospel in the heart of that blessed object Christ Jesus.—You say, “ the law is in the Surety's heart.”—Mr. H. says, we are not to go to Zion for salvation, and to Sinai for rules, for both are given forth by Zion's King.—*The law went forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.*—You say, the believer “ receives the law as a directory from the hand of the Mediator.”—Mr. H. asserts, that the person who has the Surety's righteousness on him, and the spirit of God in him, is the man *in whom the righteousness of the law is fulfilled, while he walks not after the flesh but after the Spirit.*—You say, the believer “ cannot
D 2 “ walk

“ walk according to the law as a rule, any further
 “ than he walks in the Spirit.”

Thus, Madam, while you attempt to ridicule and injure Mr. H.'s ministry, you have established every branch of what his adversaries call Antinomianism, and made your honourable allies appear as false accusers of him and his ministry both.—If you was but acquainted with *the power* as well as some part of the letter of religion, the people would call you an Huntingtonian. As a *mother in Israel*, you no doubt, will go on to lay your injunctions upon Lemuel—even *Lemuel the son of your vows*; and, as the head of the whole church, put forth your precepts, give your interdictions, and offer your benedictions, swaddled in candour, clothed with meekness, shod with sweetness, and ornamented with universal charity, and fleshly affections.

You have asserted, that one of Mr. Huntington's friends wished you not to publish your Letter addressed to him.—It could not be one of Mr. H.'s *friends*, nor a friend to *truth*; because the more hypocrisy is exposed, the easier it is confuted, and the sooner routed.

If any one dissuaded you from it, it must have been to hide your shame, and prevent you from exposing your own ignorance and a bad cause.—You are commanded *to hold fast that which you have, that no one take your crown*.—If God should deal with *you* for this your rebellion against his
 3 command,

command, as Ahasuerus did with Vashti for her rebellion, what would become of the crown you pretend to. Surely you have set a worse example for the daughters of Zion, than Vashti did for the ladies of Persia and Media, from whom it was feared there would arise too much contempt and wrath, Est. i. 18. to prevent which the queen was deposed, though her crime was nothing like yours, nor was she so high in her own sight as you are by daring presumption.

It is expected, Madam, that you will magnify your present assumed office, and acquit yourself in this business with that candour, truth, and honour, that becomes the dignified character of a Teacher of Teachers, according to your own doctrine; until which I shall take my leave of you, and conclude, Reverend Madam, with all the respect and submission that is due to the dignified character and exalted office of so venerable a-matron as a Mother Abbess,

ELIZABETH MORTON.

No. 54, Paternoster Row.



Shortly will be published,

A

S E R M O N;

ENTITLED

THE MUSIC AND ODOURS OF SAINTS.

Preached at PROVIDENCE CHAPEL,
Sept. 2, 1787.

By WILLIAM HUNTINGTON, S. S.

From Rev. v. 8.

*And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and
four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb,
having every one of them harps, and golden vials
full of odours, which are the prayers of saints.*

THE NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHIVES

ENTRANCE

THE NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHIVES

THE NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHIVES



THE NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHIVES